

### **REMARKS**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claim rejections set forth in the Office Action dated July 25, 2006.

#### **Summary**

Claims 1 and 15 were amended.

Claim 23 was added. Claim 23 finds support on at least page 9 at lines 22 – 24 of the originally filed application.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 9, 17, 18 and 22 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claim 15 was objected to because of minor informalities. The Applicant has amended Claim 15 to obviate the cited informalities as generally suggested by the Examiner.

#### **Claims Rejections**

Claims 1 – 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Figure 2 of applicants admitted prior art (AAPA).

Claim 1 recites a television tuner comprising, *inter alia*, a first shield plate, which is substantially planar with the second side plate, divides the frame into a first division adjacent to the first side plate and a second division adjacent to the second side plate.

Figure 2, which illustrates the applicant's admitted prior art fails to disclose each and every element of recited Claim 1. Figure 2 discloses a contrary arrangement. As shown in Figure 2, a first side plate 52 is disposed perpendicularly to the second side plate 51b. Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over the cited prior art.

Dependent Claims 2 - 3, 5, 6, 10 and 11 depend from an allowable base claim, so are allowable for at least this reason.

### **Provisional Rejection**

Claims 1 – 3, 5, 6 and 10 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 3 and 10 – 12 of copending Application No. 10/932,748. Claim 1 of the present application recites, *inter alia*, a first shield plate, which is substantially planar with the second side plate. The present application is patentably distinct from copending Application No. 10/932,748 because Claims 1 – 3 and 10 – 12 do not recite or suggest a first shield plate, which is substantially planar with the second side plate. The limitations recited in the claims of the '748 application, claim a structure that is non-obvious over the claims of the present application. Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 1 – 8, 10, 12 – 16, 18, 20 and 21 were provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 4 and 8 – 10 of copending Application No. 10/932,972. Claim 1 of the present application recites, *inter alia*, a first shield plate, which is substantially planar with the second side plate. The present application is patentably distinct from copending Application No. 10/932,972 because Claims 1 – 4 and 8 - 10 do not recite a first shield plate, which is substantially planar with the second side plate. The limitations recited in the claims of the '972 application, claim a structure that is non-obvious over the claims of the present application. Accordingly, Claim 1 is allowable over the cited prior art.


Independent Claim 15 has been amended to incorporate the feature of allowable Claim 22. Thus, Claim 15 is allowable for at least this reason.

Dependent Claims 2 – 8, 10, 12 – 14, 16, 18, 20 and 21 depend from an allowable base claim, so are allowable for at least this reason.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons presented above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Respectfully submitted,



Gustavo Siller, Jr.  
Registration No. 32,305  
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200